

**Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation**

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

**MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION****PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

Requestor's Name and Address:	MFDR Tracking #: M4-09-4639-01
HARRIS METHODIST OF FORT WORTH 3255 W PIONEER PKWY ARLINGTON TX 76013	
Respondent Name and Box #:	
TRANSPORTATION INSURANCE CO. Rep Box # 47	

**PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION**

Requestor's Position Summary: "Understanding that TWCC is wanting to move to a hospital reimbursement of a %-over-Medicare, we have used that methodology in our calculation of fair and reasonable. Medicare would have reimbursed the provider at the base APC rate of \$1,875.550 [sic] for APC #0041. Allowing this at 140% would yield a fair and reasonable allowance of \$2,657.44. Based on their payment a supplemental payment is still due of \$1,536.94, at this time."

## Principal Documentation:

1. DWC 60 Package
2. Total Amount Sought - \$1536.94
3. Hospital Bill
4. EOBs
5. Medical Records

**PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION**

Respondent's Position Summary: "It is the Carrier's position that the Health Care Provider, Harris Hospital HEB has not timely requested Medical Fee Dispute Resolution to this date. Because Harris Hospital HEB has not timely filed any DWC 60 to this date, any such DWC 60 filed at this point would be untimely as per Rule 133.307(c)(1) which indicates that a request for medical dispute resolution must be filed no later than one year after the date of service in dispute."... "The Carrier's bill review service, Coventry WC Services, indicated a reimbursable allowance for CPT code 29881 from the charges amount of \$2,558.50 to a reimbursable amount of \$900.00. This reduction represents a fair and reasonable amount. Carrier contends that payment of the recommended allowance equals payment of the outpatient facility charges at a fair and reasonable amount pursuant to the criteria set forth in Texas Labor Code section 413.011(b) of the Texas Workers Compensation Act."

## Principal Documentation:

1. Response to DWC 60

**PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
1/14/2008	150, 900-030, 193, 920-002, 850-243, 900-068, 97, 855-013	Outpatient Surgery	\$1536.94	\$0.00
<b>Total /Due:</b>				\$0.00

**PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION**

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division Rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Medical Reimbursement*, effective May 2, 2006 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

1. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason codes:
  - 150 – Payment adjusted because the payer deems the information submitted does not support this level of service. This change to be effective 4/1/2008: Payer deems the information submitted does not support this level of service.
  - 900-030-CV: This charge was reviewed through the clinical validation program.
  - 193 – Original payment decision is being maintained. Upon review, it was determined that his claim was processed properly.
  - 920-002-In response to a provider inquiry, we have re-analyzed this bill and arrived at the same recommended allowance.
  - 850-243-CV: the recommended allowance reflects a fair, reasonable and consistent methodology or reimbursement pursuant to the criteria set forth in section 413.011(D) of the Texas Workers' Compensation Act. M-No MAR \$0.00, \$19.00, \$900.00.
  - 900-068-CV: Additional reconsideration of this bill and submitted documentation does not support additional payment. Recommended final allowance.
  - 97 – The benefit for this service is included in the payment/allowance for another service/procedure that has already been adjudicated.
  - 855-013-Payment denied-The service is included in the global value of another billed procedure. \$0.00.
2. This dispute relates to outpatient surgery services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 2, 2006, 31 TexReg 3561, which requires that, in the absence of an applicable fee guideline, reimbursement for health care not provided through a workers' compensation health care network shall be made in accordance with subsection §134.1(d) which states that "Fair and reasonable reimbursement: (1) is consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011; (2) ensures that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement; and (3) is based on nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, and values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, if available."
3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
4. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2), effective May 25, 2008, and applicable to disputes filed on or after May 25, 2008, 31 TexReg 3954, requires that the request shall include "Provider Request. The provider shall complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division..." This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on January 2, 2009. A review of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution for DWC-60 finds that the requestor incorrectly listed Harris Methodist of Fort Worth as the requestor's name instead of Harris Methodist HEB. Therefore, the requestor has failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2).
5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(A), effective May 25, 2008, and applicable to disputes filed on or after May 25, 2008, 31 TexReg 3954, requires that the request shall include "(A) a copy of all medical bill(s), in a paper billing format using an appropriate DWC approved paper billing format, as originally submitted to the carrier and a copy of all medical bill(s) submitted to the carrier for reconsideration in accordance with §133.250 of this chapter (relating to Reconsideration for Payment of Medical Bills)." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided a copy of all medical bill(s) as originally submitted to the carrier and as submitted for reconsideration. The requestor submitted the original bill and an itemized bill, but not the reconsideration bill. Therefore, the requestor has failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(A).
6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(C), effective May 25, 2008, and applicable to disputes filed on or after May 25, 2008, 31 TexReg 3954, requires that the request shall include "the form DWC-60 table listing the specific disputed health care and charges in the form and manner prescribed by the Division." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the documentation does not support that the services in dispute were rendered on the dates of service listed on the requestor's *Table*. The *Table* lists the disputed date of service as 1/14/2008. However, the submitted bill indicates that the date of service for the disputed charges is for date of service 1/9/2008 and 1/14/2008. Therefore, the requestor has failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(C).
7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii), effective May 25, 2008, and applicable to disputes filed on or after May 25, 2008, 31 TexReg 3954 requires that the request shall include "how the Labor Code, Division rules, and fee guidelines impact the disputed fee issues."... Review of the requestor's position statement finds that the requestor has not discussed how the Labor Code, Division rules and fee guidelines impact the disputed fee issues. The Division concludes that the requestor has not completed the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division as required by Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii).

8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv), effective May 25, 2008, and applicable to disputes filed on or after May 25, 2008, 31 TexReg 3954 requires that the request shall include “a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include”... “how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue.”... Review of the requestor’s documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not completed the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division as required by Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv).
9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(G), effective May 25, 2008, and applicable to disputes filed on or after May 25, 2008, 31 TexReg 3954, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement) when the dispute involves health care for which the Division has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR), as applicable”... The requestor’s position statement asserts that “...Medicare would have allowed the provider at the base APC rate of \$1,875.550 [sic] for APC #0041. Allowing this at 140% would yield a fair and reasonable allowance of \$2,657.44.” However the requestor did not discuss or explain how it determined that 140% of the Medicare rate would yield a fair and reasonable reimbursement. Nor did the requestor submit evidence, such as redacted EOBs showing typical carrier payments, nationally recognized published studies, Division medical dispute decisions, or documentation of values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, to support the proposed methodology. Nor has the requestor discussed how the proposed methodology would be consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011, or would ensure similar reimbursement to similar procedures provided in similar circumstances. Additionally, the requestor did not provide documentation, such as Medicare fee schedules, redacted EOBs, payment policy manual excerpts, or other evidence, to support the Medicare payment calculation. Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not discussed, demonstrated or justified that the payment amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with 28 TAC §134.1. The request for additional reimbursement is not supported.
10. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2), §133.307(c)(2)(A), §133.307(c)(2)(C), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv) and §133.307(c)(2)(G). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to meet its burden of proof to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

#### **PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES**

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), § 413.031 and § 413.0311  
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.250, §133.307, §134.1  
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

#### **PART VII: DIVISION DECISION AND/OR ORDER**

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the Requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

#### **DECISION:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

11/20/09

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

#### **PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL**

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division Rule 148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code Section 413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code Section 413.031.

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**